

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 87 stands objected to because of informalities.

Claims 87-94 stand rejected under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 8-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,761,317.

Claims 87-94 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,460,769.

Claims 87-94 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,015,091

Claims 87-94 are allowable over the prior art of record.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claim 87. Claims 87-94 are presently pending.

**The Objection to Claim 87**

Claim 87 stands objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended claim 87 in accordance with the comments of the Examiner to correct the informality. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments do not relate to any issues of patentability and do not narrow the scope of the claims.

**The Rejections under Double Patenting**

Claims 87-94 stand rejected under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 8-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,761,317. Claims

87-94 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,460,769. (Here, the correct identity of the applied patent was clarified in a telephone interview on September 26, 2005.) Claims 87-94 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,015,091. While Applicants do not concede to the rationale of the Office Action, Applicants submit Terminal Disclaimers concurrently herewith to obviate the rejection without prejudice or disclaimer.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:



Robert J. Goodell  
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: October 12, 2005

Customer Number 009629  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
202-739-3000